

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

AMANDA JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

NORDSTROM et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-01813-LK

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
SERVICE

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Amanda Johnson’s “Motion the Court to Service the Defendant[s].” Dkt. No. 24. Her one sentence motion states that she is “motioning the court to serve all of the defendant[s].” *Id.* at 1. The Court construes the motion as a request that the Court order the U.S. Marshals to serve her amended complaint.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(c)(3), “[a]t the plaintiff’s request, the court may order that service be made by a United States marshal or deputy marshal or by a person specially appointed by the court.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3). But the court is not obligated to do so unless the plaintiff is “authorized to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 or as a seaman under 28 U.S.C. § 1916.” *Id.* Ms. Johnson has paid the filing fee and is not proceeding in forma pauperis

1 or as a seaman. *See* Nov. 28, 2023 Docket Entry. The Court therefore is not required to order  
2 service.

3 When a plaintiff has paid the filing fee, Rule 4(c)(3) “vests the Court with discretion to  
4 order service.” *Chan v. Ryan*, No. 22-CV-01796-LK, 2023 WL 197429, at \*3 (W.D. Wash. Jan.  
5 17, 2023). “This discretion is exercised only in limited circumstances, such as when a law  
6 enforcement presence appears necessary or advisable to keep the peace or when a hostile defendant  
7 threatens injury to the process server.” *Id.* (quotation marks and citation omitted). Plaintiffs  
8 seeking court-ordered service should set forth what steps they have already taken to accomplish  
9 service and explain why a court order is necessary. *Id.* Here, Ms. Johnson does not explain what  
10 steps, if any, she has taken to accomplish service or why she needs the Court’s assistance to do so.  
11 The Court therefore declines to order service, *see Davis v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, No. C23-  
12 1838-JLR, 2024 WL 1023502, at \*1–2 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 7, 2024); *Carter v. Thrasher*, No. C22-  
13 0050-BHS, 2022 WL 782424, at \*1–2 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 15, 2022), and DENIES Ms. Johnson’s  
14 motion for service, Dkt. No. 24.

15 Dated this 3rd day of June, 2024.

16 

17 Lauren King  
18 United States District Judge  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24